



INTERAGENCY PERCHLORATE STEERING COMMITTEE

Perchlorate Stakeholders Forum (May 19-21, 1998)
***DRAFT*/Summary of Evaluation Forms**

May 19 (Day 1) Evaluations (total forms collected=27)

1. How did you learn about the perchlorate stakeholders forum?

Mailing from USEPA Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water:	5
Mailing from USEPA Region 9 office (San Francisco, CA):	4
Newspaper article:	1
Television story - which station?:	0
Other (please specify):	20
Lake Mead Water Quality Forum	
IPSC - either from IPSC member or participation on IPSC	
PSG (Perchlorate Steering Group)	
from Dan Rogers	
from Carmen White	
E-mail - the Pardalis Enviro Safe eLetter	
- the steering committee	
- from David Tsui	
Colleague/client	
Nevada contacts	
"Daily Regulatory Reporter"	
Originally from an environmental waco, then Kevin Mayer	

2. Do you think the selections of topics for Day 1 of the forum was appropriate?

Yes: **25**

No: **3** (one participant answered yes/no)

Your comments and suggestions:

- ✓Very wide-ranging, but it is wide-ranging issue.
- ✓But I think the tribal concerns were overdone. While valid it would have been expeditious if the concerns were consolidated and not delivered w/angry.
- ✓Less time for Tribe comments/concerns. Should have opportunity to express concerns, but not so much time. Also should be better prepared.

- ✓Less risk assessment
- ✓Why no epidemiology?
- ✓It was very thorough in the presentation of how the RfC will be developed, as well as history Of issues supporting this forum.
- ✓Perchlorate analytical methods should be day one. Judging the other data presented hinges on the credibility of the fundamental data.
- ✓Copies of handouts.
- ✓Partly yes, partly no (answering question). Non-technical folks left early-you lost them.
- ✓What about a medical doctor to tell us about human health effects of perchlorate.
- ✓Less time arguing about who is in the loop and when-this issue is so new it doesn't make much difference if one agency found out one month sooner than another.
- ✓But why wasn't a member of the public (other than tribes) allowed to make a presentation in any of the sessions?
- ✓The topics should have included the results of the Tera studies. Convening this conference without these studies was a serious error in judgement.
- ✓May have one or two too many due to the time crunch!

3. Did you find the presentations informative?

Excellent: 4
 Good: 21
 Fair: 2
 Poor: 0

(one participant commented "actually good to excellent")

What would make them better? Your comments and suggestions:

- ✓Better P.A. system.
- ✓Better AV equipment availability.
- ✓Too much info. in one day.
- ✓Toxicity quite technical. Would have been more useful and informative presented in a less technical way.
- ✓Shorter-more breaks (I have a short attention span, much of toxicology is a stretch for me).
- ✓Because of the large amount of material that needed to be presented, it would have been helpful to limit statement, lectures, long comments to brief statements.
- ✓Better English (laymens terms) discussion of toxicology-less jargon-I understood most of it but don't think some other did based on comments.
- ✓ Day 1 (session 2) too technical, especially toxicology.
- ✓Most of my questions I had at the beginning of the forum were answered.
- ✓Written questions only!!! Some participants are abusing the forum and speakers for their own agendas.
- ✓Due to depth of discussion - copies to spark thoughts at a future date.
- ✓More plain language substance, fewer acronyms and fewer long lists of scheduling (versus

issues). There is more to QA/QC than talking about schedules and saying things will be sent for peer review.

- ✓Make sure the speakers are speaking into the microphone!
- ✓Direct input from a member of the public in the keynote sessions, or other opening day statements.
- ✓Knowledgeable stakeholders were left out of the process, except for Native Americans.
- ✓Handouts of technical presentations would be very helpful.
- ✓Native American presentation hobbled by the need for multiple speakers, but the inefficiency was a reminder of the human element of the problem.
- ✓Should be more specific.
- ✓Too technical and not general enough for the public.
- ✓Facilitator needs to assist speakers in keeping to schedule.
- ✓Explore the idea of separate forums for risk management (e.g. public perception) and science.
- ✓Tox. topics overlapped too much (seemed redundant).

4. Did you like the format of Day 1 of the forum (e.g. presentations followed by facilitated discussions)?

Yes: 23
No: 3

Your comments and suggestions:

- ✓Either shorter agenda or more breaks; it was too much and Q&A tended to be cut off.
- ✓More discussions would have been useful-although there may not have been enough questions. Panel discussions might have drawn more people out with questions.
- ✓Session after lunch was quite dry and would be better slotted possibly in a morning session rather than right after lunch. It was hard to stay alert during the beginning of the afternoon session. The latter part of the afternoon session was fine.
- ✓Too much redundancy.
- ✓Keep the list of speakers short and discussions after short breaks.
- ✓Keep on the time schedule.
- ✓Scheduling was off. There should have been an easier way to ask some hard nose questions. Too much went by that lacked critical thinking.
- ✓This encouraged a lengthy discussion on material which was not relevant to the issue at hand-how to solve the ClO_4^- issue.
- ✓Except see comment #2.
- ✓See #3

5. Did you like the forum location and facilities?

Yes: 24

No: 1

Your comments and suggestions:

- ✓ Should have been more valley central.
- ✓ It would be helpful to include all affected areas of the country instead of focusing on CA and the Colorado River system.
- ✓ Except room was a little too cold. No vegetarian lunch items on menu offered.
- ✓ However, for a meeting facility, I would think that more phones would be available. Similarly, some information on where to get lunch would have been helpful.
- ✓ Good to keep meetings away from the Strip.
- ✓ It worked fine.
- ✓ However more telephones would be nice.
- ✓ Hold the next one in Redlands or Rancho Cordova-give groundwater contaminated with perchlorate equal time.
- ✓ Excellent.
- ✓ Yes, I'm the one who prefers Henderson over Las Vegas! Las Vegas is very close, however.
- ✓ Good choice.

Please use the space below to provide feedback on aspects of Day 1 of the forum that worked well for you (✓ column) and on aspects of the forum which you would change (▲ column).

Comments in ✓ column:

- ✓ The facilitated discussions are helpful as long as the time frames are strictly adhered to.
- ✓ I thought it went fairly well, with a decent agenda laid out. Other comments provided above.
- ✓ I enjoyed the keynote presentations (Thomas W. L. McCall, Allen Biaggi).
- ✓ It is nice to see how many people are interested in the perchlorate problem.
- ✓ The tribal concerns regarding perchlorate seemed to be an opportunity for EPA to increase stakeholder involvement.
- ✓ Written summaries provided.
- ✓ Mechanisms of thyroid toxicity.
- ✓ Update-drinking water.
- ✓ Toxicology (Jarabek radiates competence).
- ✓ Native American leaders (Presented the challenge of communicating the uncertainties to the public).
- ✓ Want to see more representations from other states that have perchlorate in their groundwater. The only data presented was that on California and Nevada. How about Utah, Arizona and other states.

- ✓ Occurrence
- ✓ Lunch brought in-very handy.
- ✓ The overall discussion on the status of EPA's, DOD's, and the participating states investigation into perchlorate is well done.
- ✓ The facilitation of the 2nd days discussion went much better.

Comments in ▲ column:

- ▲ Maybe offer presentations at different levels of expertise at the same time, so we all receive the information at our respective levels of understanding.
- ▲ Too much toxicology.
- ▲ Either have microphones for speakers, or repeat questions for all to hear.
- ▲ Handout of the viewgraphs would have been nice! I had trouble copying all the info. Before the viewgraph was removed.
- ▲ Decrease the amount of info/background on speaker introductions-give us a printed biography!
- ▲ Put other water suppliers on forum.
- ▲ Copies of the presentations to review.
- ▲ Many workers exposed over long terms at a variety of facilities. Is EPA aware of any symptoms/conditions/or documented effects from perchlorate.
- ▲ Development of study protocols/QA/QC.
- ▲ Jarabek-too many acronyms and technical medical terms.
- ▲ Native American leaders-too much time allotted.
- ▲ Toxicology presentations did not need to be so technical for the type of audience.
- ▲ Facilitator needs to be more active in keeping to schedule. Some presentations seemed to be allowed to drift into extraneous/old arguments from the IPSC.
- ▲ Complicated formula/data should not be right after lunch.
- ▲ The focus on only CA & NV is disappointing, because this problem has boundaries that reach further than these two states. For example, Utah, where we have 3 areas w/confirmed contamination and have a potential of four other sites. This problem isn't just CA & NV's problem.

May 20 (Day 2) Evaluations (total forms collected=19)

1. Do you think the selection of topics for Day 2 of the forum was appropriate?

Yes: 17

No: 0

No comments or suggestions.

2. Did you find the presentations informative?

Excellent: 4

Good: 17 (some answered Excellent and Good)

Fair: 0

Poor: 0

What would make them better? Your comments and suggestions:

- ✓Poster board session.
- ✓Slightly longer presentations 20-25 minutes.
- ✓Rules for questions-no dissertations, advertisements or destructive statements!
- ✓More detail on treatment.
- ✓It is important to put technical information in a form that people can understand.
- ✓Rick Sase's presentation was entertaining but little substance. It would be a good idea to have somebody review content of presentations.
- ✓They were very good, well thought out, although some of them became a bit dry and technical.
- ✓Perhaps, somewhat shorter. More breaks in p.m.
- ✓For the general public some presentations may be too technical.
- ✓Handouts to follow along on.
- ✓I have an M.S. in chemical eng. and I couldn't follow most of it. I feel sorry for the "community stakeholders" (too technical and complex)

3. Did you like the format of Day 2 of the forum (e.g. presentations followed by facilitated discussions, revisions to process from Day 1 evaluations etc.)?

Yes: 16

No: 0

Your comments and suggestions:

- ✓Good forum and organization.
- ✓Questions after several speakers (related topics) works well. Q/A are less "dry."
- ✓Should have finished all discussion by end of Day 2. Meeting should have been conducted over 2 days only.
- ✓It appeared a little more organized.

- ✓The mike in the middle was good.
- ✓Things went much smoother-having all comments in writing would aid the panelists, IPSC, and other attendees as there would be a record of "brain storming."
- ✓Better than day 1.
- ✓Need a strong facilitator to keep us on time and on subject.
- ✓Both were OK.

4. Please use this space to list items/issues that you would like to see discussed in the Day 3 morning session. Based on the summary of discussions so far, and your input now, the facilitation team will attempt to design a framework so that we can cover the outstanding items and issues.

- ✓Calendar for next 12-18 months with everyone contributing items-e.g. EPA decisions, expected/possible state actions, research actions, etc.
- ✓Web site architecture and content - fast/good/cheap
- ✓I'm very interested in the next steps of the Steering Committee as well as (if any) what immediate steps will be taken to assure the people of the affected locations, that the H₂O supply is indeed safe for consumption, daily use and recreational enjoyment. I have 3 day old son...I want to know he can safely be bathed and fed!
- ✓Reiterate the list of outstanding issues-i.e. things that need more research or study/or answers.
- ✓When presenters information (copies of slides) will be sent.
- ✓ Best method to communicate site specific info. to the IPSC.
- ✓ After it being brought out that Colorado River water affects 23 million⁺ people, will this affect any of EPA's/CA's/NV's/AZ's priorities as far as sampling and risk assessment? (I'm not affected, except for lettuce and other produce).
- ✓ Could have improved with more time/detail.
- ✓ Good use of time available.
- ✓ No day 3!!
- ✓ Many of us in the engineering community know the advantages/disadvantages of our and competing technologies but no one likes to bad mouth another companies product in front of potential clients. It would be nice to have an open engineering forum to talk about technologies without company names (i.e. Calgon, Osmonics, Betz, etc.)